

**PUBLIC COPY**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
20 Massachusetts Avenue NW, Rm. A3042  
Washington, DC 20529



U.S. Citizenship  
and Immigration  
Services

identifying data deleted to  
prevent clearly unwarranted  
invasion of personal privacy

H2

FILE:



Office: LIMA, PERU


Date: NOV 19 2004

IN RE:



APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under Section 212(i) of the  
Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(i)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:



INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All documents have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

Robert P. Wiemann, Director  
Administrative Appeals Office

**DISCUSSION:** The waiver application was denied by the Acting Officer in Charge, Lima, Peru. The matter is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The applicant is a native and citizen of Peru who was found by a consular officer to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(6)(C)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(6)(C)(i), for having attempted to procure a visa for admission to the United States by fraud or willful misrepresentation. The applicant is the daughter of a citizen of the United States and seeks a waiver of inadmissibility in order to reside in the United States with her mother and siblings.

The acting officer in charge (OIC) concluded that the applicant had failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Excludability (Form I-601) accordingly. *Decision of the Acting Officer in Charge*, dated September 15, 2003.

On appeal, counsel states that the OIC erred in holding that the applicant did not meet the burden of proving extreme hardship under the Act. *Attachment to Form I-290B*, dated October 10, 2003. Counsel requests 30 days in which to submit a brief and/or evidence in support of the appeal. *Form I-290B*. The AAO notes that over one year has elapsed since the filing of the appeal and no additional documentation has been received into the record.

The record reflects that during an interview with a consular officer on November 14, 1994, the applicant claimed to be single in order to obtain a visa for admission to the United States as the unmarried child of a lawful permanent resident of the United States. The applicant admitted that she was married when the interviewing consular officer confronted her with her marriage certificate.

Section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

- (i) Any alien who, by fraud or willfully misrepresenting a material fact, seeks to procure (or has sought to procure or has procured) a visa, other documentation, or admission into the United States or other benefit provided under this Act is inadmissible.

Section 212(i) of the Act provides:

- (1) The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] may, in the discretion of the Attorney General [Secretary], waive the application of clause (i) of subsection (a)(6)(C) in the case of an alien who is the spouse, son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to the United States of such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such an alien.

A section 212(i) waiver of the bar to admission resulting from violation of section 212(a)(6)(C) of the Act is dependent first upon a showing that the bar imposes an extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship the alien herself experiences upon deportation is irrelevant to section 212(i) waiver proceedings; the only relevant hardship in the present case is that suffered by the

applicant's parent. Once extreme hardship is established, it is but one favorable factor to be considered in the determination of whether the Secretary should exercise discretion. *See Matter of Mendez*, 21 I&N Dec. 296 (BIA 1996).

*Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. 560 (BIA 1999) provides a list of factors the Board of Immigration Appeals deems relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship pursuant to section 212(i) of the Act. These factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate.

On appeal, the applicant fails to provide evidence relevant to a consideration of hardship under the standard outlined in *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*. The record fails to demonstrate that hardship would be imposed on the applicant's mother as a result of relocation to Peru in order to reside with the applicant. The record further fails to identify medical conditions from which the applicant's mother suffers, if any, and fails to document the financial impact of departure from the United States for the applicant's mother.

Counsel states that the applicant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that extreme hardship is imposed on the applicant's mother as a result of the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. *Attachment to Form I-290B*. Counsel further asserts that the applicant's mother gave an account that should be sufficient to overcome the applicant's prior error. *Id.* While the AAO acknowledges that counsel cites precedent to support his contentions, counsel fails to provide documentation relevant to the instant application to illustrate the applicability of the cited case law.

The record contains a statement from the applicant's mother, dated July 28, 2003 and a statement from the applicant, dated July 30, 2003. The applicant's mother states that she dreams of uniting her family in the United States. *Letter from Maria Isabel Ascencio Cortez*, dated July 28, 2003. U.S. court decisions have repeatedly held that the common results of deportation or exclusion are insufficient to prove extreme hardship. *See Hassan v. INS*, 927 F.2d 465, 468 (9th Cir. 1991). For example, *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627 (BIA 1996), held that emotional hardship caused by severing family and community ties is a common result of deportation and does not constitute extreme hardship. In addition, *Perez v. INS*, 96 F.3d 390 (9th Cir. 1996), held that the common results of deportation are insufficient to prove extreme hardship and defined extreme hardship as hardship that was unusual or beyond that which would normally be expected upon deportation. *Hassan v. INS*, *supra*, held further that the uprooting of family and separation from friends does not necessarily amount to extreme hardship but rather represents the type of inconvenience and hardship experienced by the families of most aliens being deported. Moreover, the AAO notes that the U.S. Supreme Court held in *INS v. Jong Ha Wang*, 450 U.S. 139 (1981), that the mere showing of economic detriment to qualifying family members is insufficient to warrant a finding of extreme hardship. The AAO recognizes that the applicant's mother endures hardship as a result of separation from the applicant. However, her situation, based on the record, is typical to individuals separated as a result of deportation or exclusion and does not rise to the level of extreme hardship.

A review of the documentation in the record fails to establish the existence of extreme hardship to the applicant's mother caused by the applicant's inadmissibility to the United States. Having found the applicant statutorily ineligible for relief, no purpose would be served in discussing whether she merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(i) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. *See* Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

**ORDER:** The appeal is dismissed.